**Critical Thinking and Maharishi Vedic Science**

**Wholeness of the Lesson**

The importance of critical thinking in modern thought can be traced to the success of science in the modern world. This status is based on an approach to knowledge that begins in *ignorance* and systematically tries to uncover the truth about man and nature. Maharishi Vedic Science, however, presents *cognitions of universal truth* about man and nature, which we are trying to verify at this point in history. This can create challenges when applying critical thinking to Maharishi Vedic Science.

1. **Consistency of Maharishi Vedic Science and philosophy of science.** Critical thinking starts with systematic analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of the logic and evidence for disciplinary claims to knowledge. These criteria, derived from the scientific method, work well for both the objective research on the technologies of Maharishi Vedic Science and its subjective ‘research in consciousness’ element. These elements of verification provide a unique opportunity to systematically understand the range of the mind and its origin in pure consciousness and are summarized in “the three eurekas.”
2. **Delicate features.** Critical thinking continues, however, with evaluation of alternative explanations for disciplinary claims to knowledge. It includes as well an attitude of open-mindedness to being wrong about these claims, derived from the sacrosanct role of objectivity (being unbiased) in modern science. The application of this intellectual and affective approach to the theories of consciousness in Maharishi Vedic Science is sometimes problematical in our community.
3. **The role of authority in science.** In the sphere of teaching, the objective attitude of modern science and critical thinking is often more highly prized than the intellectual and evidential arguments made in its favor. This objectivity issue comes to the forefront in the case of Maharishi Vedic Science with regard to the role of authority in this science. Objectivity requires that the role of authority in science be the *starting point* for further discussion of the logic and evidence in favor of a proposition, not the deciding point.